UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/822,884	03/30/2001	Jerrald W. Jones	010059	6166

26285	7590	11/17/2004	

KIRKPATRICK & LOCKHART LLP
535 SMITHFIELD STREET
PITTSBURGH, PA 15222

EXAMINER
DIVINE, LUCAS

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2624	

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/822,884	JONES ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Lucas Divine	2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>30 March 2001</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-4,6-9 and 11-15</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-4,6-9 and 11-15</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>30 March 2001</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Preliminary Amendment

1.   Claims 1, 9, and 14 are accepted as a preliminary amendment as requested.

2.   Claims 5 and 10 are canceled as requested.

Claim Objections

3.   Claims 1 – 8 are objected to because of the following informalities: the method claims

do not include appropriate step language. The claim language would be more complete if

"comprising the step(s) of" replaced "comprising" in claims 1 – 8.   Appropriate correction is

required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4.   Claims 1 – 4 and 6 – 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1, Examiner does not understand where the identification is located

from the description in claim 1. In lines 5 and 6 the claim states that **a first software**

identification is located:1) **in a /dev/dty/ directory**; and 2) **in one or more program**

instructions for said CSN platform. Sentence clarification as to where the software

identification is located within is required.

Regarding claims 2 – 4 and 6 – 8, these claims are rejected due to their dependence on

rejected claim 1, thus inheriting the rejected limitations.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis

for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5.   Claims 1 – 4, 7 – 10, and 12 – 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated

by Advani et al. (Re. 36, 394) hereafter referred to as Advani.

Regarding claim 14, Advani teaches a binding system and technique to link a hardware

port id to a device id generically applicable to operating systems such as that in a **CSN platform**.

The system includes:

an RS232 port configured to be connected to a data input port at a read only printer via a printer cable, wherein said printer cable is configured to transmit data from said RS232 port to said data input port at said ROP (Fig. 4 specifically shows RS232 port 72 connected via a printer cable to printer 70 for the transmission of data to the printer; col. 6 lines 54-55); **and**

one or more program instructions stored in a memory for said CSN platform (Fig. 3 shows program instruction steps for executing the linking below), **wherein said one or more program instructions are configured to have:**

a first software identification linked with a second software identification so as to allow said one or more program instructions to recognize said RS232 port as a destination for data to be printed during operation of said CSN platform (Fig. 3 step 62 shows the driving of the printing device through the corresponding 'linked' RS232 port; Fig. 4 step 2 further shows that printer VPRTR has both device name and port address program instruction information within the device information file for recognizing the port associated with the device; further discussed in col. 2 lines 28-37 and line 60, col. 4 lines 23-33, and col. 6 lines 44-46),

wherein the first software identification indicates how said RS232 port is labeled in said one or program instructions (Fig. 3 program instruction step 42 specifies port number in the system, thus providing software identification for the port; col. 2 lines 32-34 and col. 6 lines 22-23),

wherein said first software identification is "r0d" in a /dev/dty/ directory (col. 1 lines 61-64 and col. 5 line 13 specifically discusses the use of a /dev root directory structure for

placing software identifications as well as throughout, wherein other UNIX /etc /usr and so forth

directory structures are used; the indication of an exact file name "r0d" is design choice and is

anticipated by Advani), **and**

wherein said second software identification indicates said destination (software

identification is assigned by program instruction step 48 in Fig. 3, wherein the device, in specific

example printer 70, is assigned a software identification; further discussed in col. 3 lines 19-20,

col. 4 line 28, col. 5 line 12, and col. 6 lines 34-36), **and**

an ROP entry enabled in said one or more program instructions, thereby activating

printer capability of said one or more program instructions (in the specific example of

Advani given in Fig. 4 and discussed in cols. 6 and 7, the printer 70 is given an identification and

further binded 'linked' to an adapter port so that the computing operating system may sent print

program instructions to the print driver and have it automatically send to the printer 70 for

printing 'activating printer capability' through the linked port; col. 7 lines 1-15).

Note: In claims 1, 9 and 14, a very specific directory is claimed for the location of

software identification. The specification discusses directories on pages 10 and 11 but does not

give the claimed directory any special meaning or significance compared to any other directory.

Thus, the choice of directory appears to be a design choice and has no specific meaning in light

of the specification. Accordingly, the claims will be analyzed without weight to a specific

directory location, just a root-type directory.

Regarding claim 15, which depends from claim 14, Advani further teaches that **said one**

or more program instructions are in the UNIX programming language (cols. 1 and 2,

wherein Advani teaches the use of his system and technique in the UNIX operating

environment).

Regarding claim 9, all of the limitations of claim 9 are the same as the limitations of

claim 14 as discussed above except for the limitations listed below. Accordingly, Advani

teaches said limitations as discussed in the rejection of claim 14 and therefore they are rejected

for the same reasons.

Advani further teaches: **a read only printer (ROP) having a data input port** (Fig. 4

shows printer 70 with cable connection, thus showing an input port to the printer for the cable to

connect).

Regarding claim 12, which depends from claim 9, Advani teaches the limitation of claim

12 as discussed in the rejection of claim 15 as it depends from claim 14. Therefore, claim 12 is

rejected for the same reasons stated in the rejection of claim 15.

Regarding claim 13, which depends from claim 9, claim 14 includes the **hardware port**

being an RS232 port and is taught by Advani as discussed in the rejection of claim 14. Claim

13 is therefore rejected for the reasons stated in the rejection of claim 14.

Regarding claim 1, Advani teaches **a method of linking a read only printer (ROP) to a**

CSN (Compact Service Node) platform at a telecommunication facility, said method

comprising:

identifying a physical location of an unassigned hardware port on the CSN platform

where said ROP is to be connected (it is inherent that modern operating systems, such as that

of Advani, keep track and are able to identify hardware ports in the system that are assigned and

unassigned to specific devices);

locating a first software identification in a /dev/dty directory (col. 1 lines 61-64 and

col. 5 line 13 specifically discusses the use of a /dev root directory structure for placing software

identifications as well as throughout, wherein other UNIX /etc /usr and so forth directory

structures are used) **for said unassigned hardware port in one or more program instructions**

for said CSN platform, wherein said first software identification indicates how said

unassigned hardware port is labeled in said one or more program instructions (Fig. 3

program instruction step 42 specifies port number in the system, thus providing software

identification for the port; col. 2 lines 32-34 and col. 6 lines 22-23), **and**

wherein said first software identification is "r0d" in the /dev/dty directory (the

indication of an exact file name "r0d" is design choice and is anticipated by Advani);

locating a second software identification in said one or more program instructions,

wherein said second software identification indicates a destination where data to be printed

during operation of said CSN are to be sent by said one or more program instructions

(software identification is assigned by program instruction step 48 in Fig. 3, wherein the device,

in specific example printer 70, is assigned a software identification; further discussed in col. 3

lines 19-20, col. 4 line 28, col. 5 line 12, and col. 6 lines 34-36); **and**

modifying said one or more program instructions so as to link said second software

identification with said first software identification, thereby allowing said one or more

program instructions to recognize said unassigned hardware port as said destination for

said data to be printed (Fig. 3 step 62 shows the driving of the printing device through the

corresponding 'linked' port; Fig. 4 step 2 further shows that printer VPRTR has both device

name and port address program instruction information within the device information file for

recognizing the port associated with the device; further discussed in col. 2 lines 28-37 and line

60, col. 4 lines 23-33, and col. 6 lines 44-46).

Regarding claim 2, which depends from claim 1, the structural elements of claim 14

includes performing the method steps of **connecting via printer cable for transmitting data**

and is taught by Advani as discussed in the rejection of claim 14. Method claim 2 is therefore

rejected for the reasons stated in the rejection of apparatus claim 14.

Regarding claim 3, which depends from claim 1, the structural elements of claim 14

includes performing the method steps of **activating a printer capability** and is taught by Advani

as discussed in the rejection of claim 14. Method claim 3 is therefore rejected for the reasons

stated in the rejection of apparatus claim 14.

Regarding claim 4, which depends from claim 1, Advani teaches a binding system and

technique to link a hardware port id to a device id generically applicable to operating systems

such as that in a CSN platform. This operating system that completes the binding 'linking' is

inherently **stored in a memory**.

Regarding claim 7, which depends from claim 1, Advani teaches the limitation of claim

12 as discussed in the rejection of claim 15 as it depends from claim 14. Therefore, claim 7 is

rejected for the same reasons stated in the rejection of claim 15.

Regarding claim 8, which depends from claim 1, claim 14 includes the **hardware port**

being an RS232 port and is taught by Advani as discussed in the rejection of claim 14. Claim 8

is therefore rejected for the reasons stated in the rejection of claim 14.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 6 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Advani.

Regarding claims 11, which depend from claim 9, Advani teaches all of the limitations of

parent claim 9 as taught above.

While Advani teaches a system for linking an unassigned port to a printing device in

software in the UNIX environment, Advani does not specifically teach that the UNIX

environment is **a Lucent® CSN-plus platform.**

However, Examiner takes Official Notice that the **Lucent® CSN-plus platform** would

have been known to be UNIX based intelligent peripheral platforms.

It would have therefore been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to place the

automatic linking peripheral system of Advani into other standard UNIX systems, such as that of

the CSN and CSN-plus platforms. The motivation for doing so would have been to create a

process for controlling a peripheral where the user does not need to worry about editing code,

assigning ports, or other operating system tasks.

Regarding claim 6, which depends from claim 1, the structural elements of claims 11

perform the all of the steps of method claim 6. Therefore, claim 6 is rejected for the same

reasons as stated above in the rejection of claim 11.

Conclusion

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lucas Divine whose telephone number is 703-306-3440. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:30am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore can be reached on 703-308-7452. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lucas Divine
Examiner
Art Unit 2624

ljd

DAVID MOORE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600